1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 No. 2:23-cv-00533-TLN-AC CHRISTIAN RAUL LOPEZ ESTRADA, 12 Plaintiff, 13 **ORDER** v. 14 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES, 15 Defendant. 16 17 Plaintiff, who is proceeding in pro se, has filed an application to proceed in forma 18 19 pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. ECF No. 2. 20 The federal venue statute provides that a civil action "may be brought in (1) a judicial 21 district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the 22 district is located, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions 23 giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated, or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in 24 25 this action, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court's personal 26 jurisdiction with respect to such action." 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). 27 In this case, the claim arose in during plaintiff's employment in Kent, Washington, which is in the Western District of Washington. ECF No. 1 at 5, 7. The sole defendant is in Olympia, 28

Case 3:23-cv-05354-RAJ Document 3 Filed 04/20/23 Page 2 of 2

1	Washington. <u>Id.</u> at 2. Therefore, plaintiff's claim should have been filed in the United States
2	District Court for the Western District of Washington. In the interest of justice, a federal court
3	may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. §
4	1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).
5	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United
6	States District Court for the Western District of Washington.
7	DATED: April 20, 2023
8	Allison Claire
9	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	